UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,408	02/04/2002	Robbie Thielemans	THIE3004/JEK	2069

23364 7590 12/04/2003

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
ANYASO, UCHENDU O	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2675	6

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/926,408	THIELEMANS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Uchendu O Anyaso	2675	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. **Claims 1-28** are pending in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. **Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 21, 22** and **25-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Nishida* (U.S. 6,097,351).

Regarding **independent claims 1**, and for **claims 21, 22, 25** and **26,** Nishida teaches a display device including an array of display elements to display information in that the display device is made up of a plurality of display units 50 (see Abstract; *see also* column 6, lines 17-21, figure 2 at 50).

Furthermore, Nishida teaches a general processing unit in the form of a control device 70, a display in the form of device casing 100 that consists of several device display units 50, and individual processing units in the form of controller 53 per display units 50 (*see* figure 2, 3 at 50, 53, 70, 100, column 6, lines 17-33; column 7, lines 1-8).

Furthermore, Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Also, Nishida teaches how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claim 2**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida teaches how the display units 50 are serially coupled (figure 2 at 50).

Regarding **claim 3**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida teaches how the display units would be made up of light emitting diodes (column 8, lines 41-67, figure 5 at 83R, 83G, 83B).

Regarding **claim 4**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida teaches how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control

communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claim 5**, in further discussion of claim 4, Nishida teaches an embodiment wherein individual display units 80 include a main body 81 that contains three light emitting diodes 83R, 83G, 83B such that when activated, they present red, green and blue colors to the pixels (column 8, lines 41-67, figure 5 at 83R, 83G, 83B).

Regarding **claim 9**, in further discussion of claim 4, Nishida teaches how distributed signal processing is at least provided for the signals by teaching how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claim 10**, in further discussion of claim 9, Nishida teaches how signal processing occurs at both the control device 70 and the display units 50 by teaching how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claims 27** and **28**, in further discussion of claim 25, Nishida teaches how the respective display units 80 can be removed for operational tests thereby making maintenance work very simple (column 10, lines 43-49, figure 10 at 80).

4. **Claims 23** and **24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Wong* (U.S. 6,005,557).

Regarding **independent claim 23**, Wong teaches a method for stabilizing a display panel image corresponding to an image information signal having an associated phase and frequency, comprising: generating a dot clock signal having an associated phase and frequency to facilitate the display of the image information signal as the image; displaying a vertical noise bar indicative of the dot clock signal frequency not corresponding to the image information signal frequency; adjusting manually a single control device to generate a clock adjust signal; controlling said dot clock signal phase and said dot clock signal frequency simultaneously in response to said clock adjust signal to help synchronize said dot clock signal phase with the image information signal phase while adjusting said dot clock signal frequency to correspond to the image information signal frequency (column 9, lines 59 through column 10, lines 17).

Regarding **claims 24,** in further discussion of claim 23, Wong teaches a time-dependent image stabilization by teaching a timer device 44 that controls the dot_clk signal 42 via the HSYNC signal (column 4, lines 4-15).

Also, Wong teaches a frequency dependent image stabilization by teaching apparatus 10 that includes a control apparatus 30 to enable the user to manually adjust the phase and frequency of the dot_clk signal 42 wherein the frequency of the dot_clk signal 42 may be adjusted to correspond to the frequency of the image information signal 12 (column 4, lines 8-15; column 3, lines 23-32, figure 1 at 10, 42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 6-8, 11-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishida* (U.S. 6,097,351) in view of *Someya et al* (U.S. 5,396,257).

Regarding **claims 6-8**, in further discussion of claim 5, Nishida does not teach how to adjust the brightness or contrast of the display device. On the other hand, Someya teaches a multiscreen display apparatus in which one large screen is formed by combining screens of a plurality of display units (*see* Abstract) wherein luminance is adjusted by the control device (*see* Abstract; column 13, lines 9-26, figure 13 at 81).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), Someya teaches how

such a device would be used to adjust luminance. The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a multiscreen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

Regarding **claim 11**, in further discussion of claim 9, Nishida does not teach how the display units adjustments operates in a frequency independent fashion. On the other hand, Someya teaches this concept by teaching that a great feature of the present embodiment is that the comparison circuit 102 and the contrast control circuit 88 and the luminance control circuit 89 controlled by the comparison circuit 102 are completely separated from the minimum value circuit 90, the ABL circuit 114 and the contrast and/or luminance control circuit 111 and hence they operate independently (column 22, lines 66 through column 23, line 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), Someya teaches how the adjustments would occur in an independent fashion. The motivation for combining these inventions would have to provide a multiscreen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

Regarding **claim 12**, in further discussion of claim 9, Someya teaches how a switching pulse (SP) is a control pulse synchronized preferably with a falling edge of a horizontal

synchronizing pulse and having a pulse width T wherein the switching pulse (SP) controls the input signal of the contrast and/or luminance control circuit 111 (column 17, lines 3-17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), teaches how a switching pulse (SP) is a control pulse synchronized preferably with a falling edge of a horizontal synchronizing pulse and having a pulse width T wherein the switching pulse (SP) controls the input signal of the contrast and/or luminance control circuit 111 (column 17, lines 3-17). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a multi-screen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

Regarding **claims 13-16**, in further discussion of claim 9, Nishida teaches how signal processing occurs at both the control device 70 and the display units 50 by teaching how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71). However, Nishida does not teach how to achieve high resolution. On the other hand, Someya teaches how the display device is wired in order to achieve a high-resolution display (column 6, lines 34-49).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), Someya teaches how how the display device is wired in order to achieve a high-resolution display (column 6, lines 34-49). The motivation for combining these inventions would have to provide a multiscreen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

7. **Claims 17-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishida* (U.S. 6,097,351) in view of *Wong* (U.S. 6,005,557).

Regarding **claim 17**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida does not teach how the display device provides image stabilization. On the other hand, Wong teaches a method and apparatus for stabilizing an image formed on a display panel (column 1, lines 5-11).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Wong because while Nishida teaches a display device with an array of display elements to display information in that the display device is made up of a plurality of display units 50 (see Abstract; *see also* column 6, lines 17-21, figure 2 at 50), Wong teaches a method and apparatus for stabilizing an image formed on a display panel (column 1, lines 5-11). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a user with a convenient adjustment technique that results in optimum stabilization (column 2, lines 10-15).

Regarding **claim 18**, in further discussion of claim 17, Wong teaches a time-dependent image stabilization by teaching a timer device 44 that controls the dot_clk signal 42 via the HSYNC signal (column 4, lines 4-15).

Also, Wong teaches a frequency dependent image stabilization by teaching apparatus 10 that includes a control apparatus 30 to enable the user to manually adjust the phase and frequency of the dot_clk signal 42 wherein the frequency of the dot_clk signal 42 may be adjusted to correspond to the frequency of the image information signal 12 (column 4, lines 8-15; column 3, lines 23-32, figure 1 at 10, 42).

Regarding **claim 19,** in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida does not teach how the display device provides a master clock correction in order to achieve image stabilization. On the other hand, Wong teaches how the dot_clk signal would be adjusted/corrected in order to appropriate image stabilization (column 6, lines 26-34, figures 6-9 at 39, 42).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Wong because while Nishida teaches a display device with an array of display elements to display information in that the display device is made up of a plurality of display units 50 (see Abstract; *see also* column 6, lines 17-21, figure 2 at 50), Wong teaches how the dot_clk signal would be adjusted/corrected in order to appropriate image stabilization (column 6, lines 26-34, figures 6-9 at 39, 42). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a user with a convenient adjustment technique that results in optimum stabilization (column 2, lines 10-15).

Regarding **claim 20,** in further discussion of claim 19, Nishida teaches an embodiment wherein individual display units 80 include a main body 81 that contains three light emitting diodes 83R, 83G, 83B such that when activated, they present red, green and blue colors to the pixels (column 8, lines 41-67, figure 5 at 83R, 83G, 83B).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 5,523,769 to *Lauer et al* for active modules for large screen displays.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uchendu O. Anyaso whose telephone number is (703) 306-5934. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Uchendu O. Anyaso

11/17/2003

STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600